

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the careful examination of the application. However, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks that follow, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the objections and rejections of the application.

Art Rejection:

Claims 1-10 have been again rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,305,496, hereinafter *Gagnon et al.* The Examiner alleges that the embodiment of *Gagnon* illustrated in Figures 3 and 4 corresponds to the present invention. However, the present invention, and in particular, as set forth in claims 1-10, is significantly different from *Gagnon*. Although Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's analysis, in order to expedite prosecution of the application, the independent claim 1 has been amended to further distinguish the invention from the applied prior art.

Specifically, *Gagnon* discloses a shock and vibration isolating caster wherein torsion elements 18 are provided between plates 14 and bearing support 20 in order to provide limited torsion between the support plates 14 and the fixed bearing support 20. The Examiner alleges that spacers 26, 28 correspond to the claimed hub body, the pivot bearing 34 corresponds to the supporting axle, and the torsion plates 18 and wheel plates 14 of *Gagnon* correspond to the claimed spring member.

According to amended claim 1, the supporting axle is now defined as extending through the at least one hub body, which is mounted so as to be pivotable about the supporting axle, and the supporting axle is mounted to and supported by

the wheel mount. Since the pivot bearing 34 of *Gagnon* does not extend through the hub body, it cannot correspond to the claimed supporting axle. Accordingly, at least this portion of claim 1 is clearly not taught or suggested by *Gagnon*.

Similar arguments apply to claim 10, wherein claim 10 indicates that the supporting axle is provided on the wheel mount and extends through the bore of the hub body so as to support the hub body and wheel, and further that the supporting axle is spaced from a central axis of the wheel. As set forth above with respect to claim 1, these features of claim 10 are also not taught or suggested by *Gagnon*.

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections.

To further define the protection to which the applicant is entitled, new dependent claims are added from claim 10. The new dependent claims are patentable at least for the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 10.

In the event that there are any questions concerning this Amendment, or the application in general, the Examiner is respectfully urged to telephone the undersigned attorney so that prosecution of the application may be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL PC

Date: December 7, 2005

By: 
William C. Rowland
Registration No. 30,888

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620